

American

NEWS & VIEWS

A Daily Newsletter from Public Affairs, American Embassy

September 15, 2004

Text: U.S. Calls for More International Security Aid for Iraq.....	1
Text: U.S. Has Five Priorities for U.N. General Assembly.....	3
Text: U.S. Engaged in Extensive Outreach on New Visa Waiver Rules	9
Text: U.S. to Target Ships from Countries with Uncertain Security	10
CIA Nominee Pledges Objective, Precise Intelligence	12

Text: U.S. Calls for More International Security Aid for Iraq

U.S. Ambassador to the U.N. briefs Security Council on Iraq

U.S. Ambassador to the United Nations John Danforth urged nations to "contribute to the future of Iraq by providing financial assistance and troops to provide security for the U.N. in Iraq," September 14.

In a report to the Security Council on the situation in Iraq, Danforth said that there is "real progress" in the efforts of the Multinational Force (MNF) to provide the means for a free, stable Iraq. But, he said, "great challenges remain," including getting more U.N. international staff into the country to help Iraq prepare for and hold national elections by January 2005.

The Security Council held an open meeting September 14 to hear reports from the United States, Iraq, and Special Representative of the Secretary General for Iraq Ashraf Qazi on events over the past three months. All three emphasized the need for more international troops and funds to increase security for U.N. workers and headquarters in Iraq. U.N. Secretary General Kofi Annan has said that he will not send a significant number of international staff into the country unless security is provided. To date, the U.N. has been unable to find nations willing to contribute troops for a battalion-size force for that effort. There are currently about 35 U.N. international staff in the country.

The ambassador said that the U.S. and the MNF look forward to increased U.N. activities that will promote the democratic process in Iraq.

"The assumption of governing authority by the Iraqi Interim Government marked the beginning of a new era for the people of Iraq," Danforth said. "However, while the new government is widely supported by the public, the transfer did not mean an end to the challenges that face us. Well-armed insurgents and terrorists remain determined to assassinate leaders, take hostages, and attack MNF and Iraqi forces."

Danforth, the chief U.S. envoy to the United Nations, also reported on the MNF's work in training the Iraqi police, border police and facilities protection service as well as efforts to restore essential services to the Iraqi people.

Following is the text of the ambassador's remarks:

Mr. President, thank you very much. I want to thank Special Representative Qazi for his very persuasive report

and beyond that for job that he and his colleagues are doing for the people of Iraq.

Mr. President, I am pleased to report to the Security Council on the efforts and progress of the Multinational Force, pursuant to Security Council Resolution 1546.

The activities that I will discuss demonstrate that the Multinational Force, working closely with the Interim Iraqi Government remains committed to a secure, stable, and democratic Iraq. Today I will report on four broad areas. First, I will discuss the current security situation in Iraq. Second, I will discuss the status of the MNF's joint effort with the Interim Iraqi Government to build and deploy Iraq's security forces. Third, I will report on the status of efforts to rebuild the infrastructure of Iraq. Finally, I will discuss our hopes and expectations regarding the future involvement of the United Nations in the rebuilding of Iraq. My remarks today will provide a summary, but we have also distributed a longer written report and it is posted on our website. It will also be issued as a document of the Security Council under the symbol S/2004/730.

SECURITY SITUATION

Before I go into details of the last three months, let me address the terrible events of the last twenty-four hours. These events bring to the fore what will be a theme in my remarks. The security situation is fragile, attacks are persistent, and lives continue to be lost. We have days where there are setbacks, and we have to acknowledge them, but that only strengthen our resolve.

Mr. President, the MNF consists of forces from over 30 countries. Countries other than the United States contribute approximately 23,000 personnel. Working closely with Iraqi Security Forces, these brave men and women have performed with admirable professionalism in their efforts to improve the security situation in Iraq.

In the two weeks following the assumption of responsibility and authority by the fully sovereign and independent Iraqi Interim Government on June 28, 2004, there was a large drop in acts of violence against MNF operations. However, in the weeks that followed, insurgents and terrorists increased their attacks against government officials, civilian contractors, foreign nationals, and the Iraqi people. As we all know, the anti-Iraqi forces resorted to horrific tactics against civilians. In August, largely as a result of Muqtada al-Sadr's illegal Mahdi militia resuming its insurrection in Najaf and the Al Thawra neighborhood in Baghdad attacks on the MNF increased as well.

To respond to these open challenges to the Iraqi government, the MNF has employed new counterinsurgency tactics and it continues to train and deploy Iraqi Security Forces. The key to defeating the insurgents and terrorists, who are tenacious and remain determined to undermine the Iraqi government, is to continue training and deploying Iraqi forces at an accelerated pace. In its endeavors, the Multinational Force coordinates closely with the Iraqi Interim Government.

SECURITY FORCES

Let me turn to the status of the MNF's joint efforts with the government to develop Iraqi Security Forces.

The Iraqi Security Forces fall under the jurisdiction of the Ministry of Defense or Ministry of Interior. Forces under the Ministry of Defense are the Iraqi Army, including the Iraqi National Guard, the Intervention Force, the Special Operations Force, the Iraqi Air Force, and the Coastal Defense Force. As of September 10, The Iraqi Ministry of Defense had over 231,000 Iraqi security forces either on duty or in training. Iraqi security forces falling under the Ministry of the Interior's jurisdiction also have a crucial role in national security. These forces include the Iraqi Police Service, the Civil Intervention Force, and the Department of Border Enforcement.

The Iraqi Police now number over 86,000. We are currently training the civil intervention force, an emergency response force, and a dignitary protection force. The goal is to have 135,000 well-equipped, highly motivated police when training efforts are complete. The Department of Border Enforcement has hired over 14,000 border police-with a goal of 32,000. In addition to these forces from the Ministries of Defense and Interior, the other Ministries are guarded by the Facilities Protection Service, which has nearly 74,000 personnel on duty.

Much work remains to be done and the insurgents have proven persistent in their attacks against the Iraqi Interim Government, their security forces, the Iraqi people, and all those seeking to assist and rebuild the new Iraq. Developing competent leadership for these forces is a top priority, and sometimes has been a challenge.

We are currently focused on assisting the Iraqi government in its efforts to instill a sense of responsibility and professionalism in the Iraqi forces, and we are optimistic that we are achieving good results. The Iraqi National Guard, for example, has performed especially well in recent weeks - fighting bravely against insurgent activities. The performance of the Iraqi Police has also improved markedly since April. But there is still a lot of work ahead.

INFRASTRUCTURE DEVELOPMENT

Mr. President, a stable, peaceful Iraq requires more than well-trained and well-equipped security and police forces. It also requires the development of a new infrastructure and the creation of economic opportunity for the Iraqi people. To that end, forces assigned to the MNF, especially civil affairs personnel, have worked to restore essential services to the Iraqi people. For example, engineering units have helped to restore power to pre-conflict levels throughout Iraq - although the events of yesterday indicate that maintaining these basic services continues to be a challenge.

They have repaired numerous bridges, ports, roads, and railroads. They have constructed schools, hospitals, post offices and other public buildings. Medical units have developed children's vaccination programs. Civil affairs personnel work daily with the Iraqis to help them form the structures needed to build a democratic society. The MNF will also be available to provide security for the upcoming Iraqi elections.

ROLE OF THE UNITED NATIONS

Mr. President, while we see real progress in the efforts of the MNF to provide the means for a free, stable Iraq, I must state candidly that great challenges remain. We believe that the United Nations will be an important part of the efforts to meet these challenges.

Resolution 1546 endows the United Nations with a leading role to advise and assist the Iraqis in preparing and holding national elections. The Transitional Administrative Law requires these elections to be no later than January 2005. Let there be no doubt: we are committed to this timetable. It also notes the creation of a distinct entity under the unified command of the MNF dedicated to providing security to the UN in Iraq. I think I speak for all member nations when I say that the horror and sorrow of the attack of August 19, 2003, are still very much with us. With the Secretary General's Special Representative Qazi and his staff of 35 dedicated people now on the ground in Iraq, I can state that the United States and the MNF remain committed to working with the international community to ensure that the UN's security needs are met. But this effort merits international support if it is to be successful. I strongly urge that member states contribute to the future of Iraq by providing financial assistance and troops to provide security for the UN in Iraq.

Time is of the essence, particularly as we look to the upcoming elections, which are to take place no later than January 31, 2005. Working together, we will help the Iraqi

government ensure that the people of Iraq reach this important milestone.

CLOSING

Mr. President, the assumption of governing authority by the Iraqi Interim Government marked the beginning of a new era for the people of Iraq. However, while the new government is widely supported by the public, the transfer did not mean an end to the challenges that face us. Well-armed insurgents and terrorists remained determined to assassinate leaders, take hostages, and attack MNF and Iraqi forces. Only the rule of law, backed by well-trained Iraqi forces, supported by a thriving infrastructure and economy, and energized by a free and fair elections process, can defeat those who wish to destabilize the country.

We look forward to increased UN activities in Iraq - activities that will promote the democratic process. You can rest assured that the MNF remains committed to working with the Iraqi people and the UN to make this possible.

Thank you, Mr. President.

*EPF206 09/14/2004

Text: U.S. Has Five Priorities for U.N. General Assembly

(Promoting democracy, economic freedom, Middle East Road Map among them)

The United States plans to promote democracy within the United Nations as one of its five priorities for the U.N. General Assembly, a State Department official says.

Mark Lagon, deputy assistant secretary of state for international organizations affairs, laid out the U.S. goals for the 59th General Assembly in remarks at the Hudson Institute in Washington September 13. Lagon said U.S. priorities seek to move the United Nations back to its founding principles.

The United States will promote democracy using the Democracy Caucus to advance cooperation among democratic nations and to ensure that General Assembly resolutions and initiatives reflect international human rights standards and democratic principles.

The Democracy Caucus first appeared at the March 2004 U.N. Human Rights Commission session.

"By advancing democracy, the Caucus will in turn advance the U.N.'s basic aims of preserving peace, expanding

economic development, and securing human rights," Lagon said. And he said the United States wants the Democracy Caucus to consider all social and human rights resolutions at the United Nations.

A second U.S. priority is advancing economic freedom, Lagon said.

"The U.N. and its members need to spend less time exhorting donors to provide more aid and more time promoting pro-growth policies," he said. Sustainable growth depends on governments that promote the rule of law and property rights, and the elimination of corruption, he said.

Also on the U.S. agenda for the General Assembly is an effort to further the Middle East peace process. President Bush's vision of Israel and a Palestinian state living in peace and security has been endorsed by the Security Council, Lagon said. The United States seeks to bring balance to the number and content of Middle East resolutions, which he said have been too numerous (21 in last year's session) and too biased against Israel in past session.

Another goal in this session is ending trafficking in persons, particularly child sex tourism. The United States expects to highlight this issue, by asking governments to expand and invigorate anti-trafficking efforts. Rescuing trafficking victims and prosecuting traffickers is a critical need, Lagon said.

He added that international partnerships are vital in this effort, since human trafficking crosses national boundaries.

A fifth U.S. priority is a ban on human cloning. The United States will join a large group of states co-sponsoring a resolution, proposed by Costa Rica, to draft an international convention against human cloning, Lagon said.

Lagon also discussed U.S. attitudes toward multilateralism, as well as examples of U.S. multilateral endeavors in food aid, HIV/AIDS funding, and refugee relief.

The text of his prepared remarks follows:

A U.N. that Lives Up to Its Founding Principles:
The U.S. Agenda at the U.N. General Assembly

Deputy Assistant Secretary of State Mark P. Lagon
Bureau of International Organization Affairs
Department of State

Hudson Institute
13 September 2004

Introduction: The U.S. View of Multilateralism

The United States is committed to the founding ideals of the United Nations. As President Bush said last year when he addressed the U.N. General Assembly, the founding documents of the U.S. and the U.N. "recognize a moral law that stands above men and nations, which must be defended and enforced by men and nations. And both point the way to peace, the peace that comes when all are free." The United Nations should be a forum where diverse countries and cultures of the world work together for freedom, democracy, peace, human rights, and prosperity for all people.

As we approach the convening of the 59th U.N. General Assembly, the U.N. faces many challenges in living up to these founding principles. Many nations do not support democratic governance or free-market economy. Developing nations complain that their views are frequently ignored. Some nations note that their status in the U.N. is not commensurate with their substantial financial contributions

Unilateralism Is Not Our Intent

I would like to speak to the comment we have often heard: that the United States acts alone, myopically concerned only with its own interests. On careful consideration of our actions, however, the charge of unilateralism is simply untrue. International peace, long-term stability, democracy building, humanitarian relief, and human rights are in the interest of all nations. The United States cannot reach those goals alone.

Multilateral diplomacy is an important tool of U.S. foreign policy. In many areas, this tool is already very effective. Multilateral cooperation in certain technical and specialized agencies of the U.N., for example, works successfully to integrate the agendas of various nations and to help those who need it most.

On the other hand, the United States has disagreed with some multilateral proposals, as have other sovereign states. We have no desire to impose our way, but like any sovereign state, we act on the basis of national interests. We are open to compromise when possible. Above all, we seek ways to advance common goals. We seek effective multilateralism. The desired end is not consensus for its own sake, but relief for those who need it -- food for the hungry, medicine for the sick, peace and reconciliation for the embattled, political freedom for the oppressed.

Examples of Multilateral Engagement

The United States is engaged in finding multilateral solutions to pressing problems, and it takes the lead on some of the world's most important relief projects. Our contributions are intended to help those in greatest need, but I am not here to seek praise for them. I will only talk briefly about the magnitude of those contributions in the hopes that other nations will consider our contributions as "challenge grants" to be matched by money from their own coffers.

Food Aid

We have a strong partnership with the U.N. on food aid, through the World Food Program [WFP]. We are proud of our role as the leading provider of aid to the WFP. The United States contributed \$1.4 billion to the WFP in 2003, nearly 57 percent of total contributions. U.S. leadership has also been instrumental in combating hunger through the G8 Famine Initiative and the Initiative to End Hunger in Africa.

Working with other governments, nongovernmental organizations, and the WFP, the United States leverages food aid to do more than reduce hunger. 120 million children, most of them girls, do not attend school, in part because of hunger or malnourishment. The 2003 McGovern-Dole International Food for Education and Child Nutrition Program provides children with nutritious meals as part of their education. In 38 countries around the world, this program feeds seven million children at school. When schools can provide nutritious meals, children and their parents have more incentive to participate in the education that will be their hope for the future. In countries where education for girls is not inherently valued, international food for education programs feed the minds and bodies of girls who might not otherwise attend school.

HIV/AIDS and Refugees

The United States is also proud to be a leading participant in other initiatives to address global health and development problems. On HIV/AIDS we have increased our budget by 143 percent since 2001. Under the President's Emergency Plan for AIDS Relief, the U.S. is providing \$15 billion, of which \$9 billion is focused on the 15 most afflicted countries. The United States is the world's biggest investor in the Global Fund to Fight AIDS.

We similarly lead the world in donations to the U.N. High Commissioner for Refugees [UNHCR]. Last year the United States contributed nearly \$390 million to UNHCR, which -- combined with \$91 million from the Japanese, \$71

million from the European Commission, \$47 million from the British, and \$12 million from the French -- will be used by the UNHCR to alleviate conditions of hardship for the world's refugees.

Disagreements and Multilateral Efforts

While we are proud of those and other multilateral efforts, there are times when the United States has disagreed with the prevalent opinion.

[International Criminal Court] ICC

One such example is the United States' stance on the International Criminal Court. As we have made clear many times, we strongly object to the view that the ICC has jurisdiction over the nationals of states not party to the Rome Statute that created the ICC. Let me be clear: The United States is committed to the goal of bringing to justice those who commit genocide, crimes against humanity, and war crimes. We do not seek "impunity" for our officials and citizens. We have a proven record of investigating and prosecuting abuses by our own personnel.

Our objection is to the structure and scope of the ICC and the Rome Statute. Specifically, the ICC is an organization that runs contrary to fundamental American precepts and our constitutional principles of popular sovereignty, checks and balances, and national independence. As a result, the United States is engaged in a global campaign to conclude bilateral agreements that will ensure Americans are not subject to the ICC's jurisdiction. We have signed 92 such Article 98 agreements.

We have received particular criticism from the European Union that Article 98 agreements undermine the Rome Statute. It is difficult to see how our attempt to protect U.S. persons would do unacceptable damage to the spirit of the treaty, when the treaty itself provides for such agreements. We respect the right of other nations to become party to the Rome statute. We ask that others accord us the same respect for our decision not to be bound by its provisions.

Current Multilateral Agenda

There are areas in which we are urgently trying to work together with other U.N. members right now. We must act cooperatively to ensure that a consensus designed to appeal to the lowest common denominator, a consensus that gives voice to oppressive regimes, is not an acceptable outcome of negotiation. When process becomes more important than results, principle is sacrificed for compromise.

Sudan

Compromise on the Commission on Human Rights has sometimes produced unacceptable results for what President Bush has called the "non-negotiable demands of human dignity" -- most recently with regard to Sudan this past Spring. The United States sought to strengthen, and ultimately voted against, a weak resolution put forward by the European Union at the Commission. Although we disagreed with the majority, the human rights community did not call us "unilateralist" in this instance. When Sudan was re-elected to the Commission, the U.S. delegation reproached the body by walking out of the meeting and issuing a public, very critical statement. With serious human rights violations continuing in Darfur, Sudan's membership on the Commission threatens to undermine not only its work, but its very credibility.

We are engaged in a day-to-day campaign to end the humanitarian crisis in Darfur. Government-backed Arab Jingawit militias have committed atrocious violations of human rights on civilian populations in Darfur, and fomented a humanitarian crisis by destroying villages, driving people from their homes, burning crops, and killing livestock. The Secretary [of State] has concluded that genocide has been committed in Darfur, and that the government of Sudan and the Jingawit bear responsibility. The situation is dire -- an estimated 1.1 million people are displaced, a million more are at risk, and nearly 200,000 have taken refuge in neighboring Chad. Food shortages and disease outbreaks threaten to increase the death toll.

On July 30 the Security Council passed a resolution outlining specific measures the government of Sudan must take to end the crisis. The resolution required that first and foremost, the Sudanese government must act to disarm the Jingawit, arrest and prosecute those responsible for crimes, protect civilians, and cooperate with humanitarian relief efforts. One month later the Sudanese government has improved humanitarian relief access to displaced people in Darfur, but has done very little to reign in the Jingawit. Security remains a grave concern. The government of Sudan's helicopter attacks on two villages on August 26 demonstrate that it just isn't part of the solution to atrocities, but remains part of the problem -- a sponsor of massive human rights abuses. Genocide has been committed in Darfur.

The United States is pursuing a new Security Council resolution this week. The resolution supports help for the people of Darfur through an expanded African Union mission, and keeps pressure on the government of Sudan to stop the violence through threat of sanctions.

Iran and the [International Atomic Energy Agency] IAEA

We must also work together to prevent Iran from producing nuclear weapons. The U.S. is convinced that Iran is using its civilian atomic energy program to hide its ability to produce nuclear weapons. At the International Atomic Energy Agency, we have been working with Britain, France, and Germany to increase pressure on Iran to cease activities that contribute to development of its nuclear weapons capability. The United States urges others on the IAEA Board of Governors to agree to report Iran's violations of its nuclear safeguards commitments to the Security Council.

The United States, its European partners, and the vast majority of the international community agree on the objective of preventing the proliferation of nuclear weapons. We sometimes disagree on how to pursue that objective within the multilateral framework of the IAEA, but we do agree on the importance of using the multilateral tools available. Some prefer to ignore the proliferation threat. Those are the countries that are undermining the multilateral system. The United States, Europe, and like-minded partners need to work together to ensure that some do not succeed in paralyzing the IAEA and to ensure that Iran does not succeed in developing a nuclear weapons capability.

Commitment to U.N. Reform

Creating successful action by the U.N. is not simply a matter of consensus, but also of improving the structure of the U.N. The United States has long sought reforms that make the U.N. more efficient and effective. Assistant Secretary Holmes has taken on the challenge of U.N. reform repeatedly and publicly at the Council on Foreign Relations, and most recently in the National Interest Online. As he notes, the U.S. recognizes that no other multilateral forum exists where nations as old and large as China and as new and small as Timor-Leste can work together as partners on such global threats as terrorism, and on such difficult problems as famine and trafficking in persons.

New thinking and reform are necessary to address shortcomings in the United Nations. Assistant Secretary Holmes has been careful to note that when we talk of the need for U.N. reform, we are careful not to lump all U.N. bodies into one basket. Some U.N. technical and specialized agencies, like the World Food Program and the World Health, operate relatively well. Reform in those cases generally means finding ways to improve their operations and make better use of resources.

Other parts of the U.N. system, like the Commission on Human Rights and the General Assembly, require more serious consideration. Such bodies often adopt resolutions that have little or no impact on the problems at hand. Reforming them will be more difficult, addressing questions that range from membership to scope of work.

To make the U.N. more effective, the United States has been working with other states and with the U.N. Secretariat on administrative and programmatic reforms. For example, we supported giving the Secretary-General more flexibility to shift positions of U.N. staff as needs dictate. We welcomed the establishment of Inspectors General positions, as well as the initiation of program evaluations and results-based budgeting.

Whatever is done to change the makeup of the Council, we believe it must reflect the principles of responsibility and accountability. Real accountability means those who bear the burden of implementing and funding the decisions should have more of a say in those decisions. Countries that contribute significantly to international peace and stability have a strong case for serving on the Security Council; terrorist-sponsoring states do not.

Principles for U.N. Reform

The place to begin for reform is with principles. With sound guiding principles in mind, reform will truly revitalize the United Nations. The principles guiding our commitment to U.N. reform are simple:

First, all of the U.N. 's subsidiary bodies, offices, and programs should live up to the vision of the founders. When the decisions of an international body are out of step with its original purpose, then the desire for consensus can become the tyranny of consensus. The body will become mired in meaningless activity or expand to areas unrelated to its original purpose.

The U.N. General Assembly, for example, would be far more authoritative if more of its members upheld the values of human rights and democracy enshrined in the U.N. Charter and the Universal Declaration on Human Rights. Similarly, when the Commission on Human Rights [CHR] includes Cuba, China, Libya, Syria, and Zimbabwe, it is predictable that perverse priorities and polemics in the CHR follow.

The second principle for reform is an expectation of effectiveness. Quite frankly, we want multilateralism that is more than just words on paper. We want results that genuinely help those in desperate need.

The third and final principle is good stewardship of U.N. resources. If U.N. agencies and commissions do not remain tightly focused on their missions, the organization's budget will continue to expand uncontrollably. The Secretary-General should continue to strengthen results-based budgeting, best practices, and other management reforms.

Democratizing the U.N. and Promoting Democracy: The Democracy Caucus

From these principles flow goals for reform. One of the most important is enhancing democracy in the U.N., in a real sense, and promoting democracy globally. The U.N. General Assembly has universal membership in the hope that inclusiveness will enhance the legitimacy of its decisions and make the United Nations more democratic. It is a misconception, however, that representation is the key element of democracy at the U.N. "Democracy" does not come simply from including more Member States; it comes when those involved truly represent will of their people.

The U.N. charter gives all nations equal vote in the General Assembly, regardless of whether a nation rules with the consent of the governed; regardless of a nation's size in population or territory; regardless of resources; regardless of their human rights record. While the "one-nation, one-vote" principle is democratic in terms of representation, it is not democratic in terms of legitimacy. Since not all countries are committed to good governance and the rule of law, a "one-nation, one-vote" system fails to yield a meaningfully democratic structure. That is, it does not always legitimately reflect the will of the people of U.N. Member States.

What can make the U.N. more democratic is including more democracies, and increasing cooperation among the existing democracies. The U.N. will continue to be more effective as the number of democracies in the world grows. As Secretary General Annan said in June of 2000, "When the founders of the United Nations met in San Francisco more than half a century ago, they knew that no foundation of peace would be sturdier than democratic government." We and the U.N. need to act upon his apt observation.

The democratic ideals and human rights standards shared by democracies can produce real and lasting results for peace and development. The Bush administration has worked closely with Poland, South Korea, Chile, Italy, Romania, and many other participants in the Community of Democracies to caucus on broad issues, such as a resolution for the promotion of democracy. This nascent Democracy Caucus in the U.N. can advance fruitful cooperation among like-minded nations.

Building and reinforcing democratic institutions should be a goal of all U.N. efforts. For example, the United Nations Development Program, the Secretariat's Electoral Assistance Unit, and UNESCO [United States Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization] all contribute to the rule of law and basic freedoms. The United States sponsored a resolution in the Commission on Human Rights that will reinforce the work of these and other programs and foster democratic values. To ensure that the promise of this resolution, which won unanimous support, is realized, the United States will provide voluntary funding of \$200,000 for its implementation.

U.S. Priorities at the 59th U.N. General Assembly

Now I would like to turn to the upcoming U.N. General Assembly, where the United States will address five priority themes:

Promoting Democracy in the U.N.

The first of these is promoting democracy at the U.N. As I mentioned earlier, we seek to fully draw on the Democracy Caucus to advance cooperation among democratic nations. The Democracy Caucus will allow countries to cooperate on resolutions and initiatives to ensure that they reflect international human rights standards and democratic principles. By advancing democracy, the Caucus will in turn advance the U.N.'s basic aims of preserving peace, expanding economic development, and securing human rights. We are working with Chile, as the host of a Community of Democracies Ministerial next year, to have regular meetings of the Democracy Caucus on all social and human rights resolutions at the U.N. And we are working with Chile to get a resolution passed in New York this fall to put the General Assembly on record that all U.N. programs promoting democracy need to work together with the Office of the High Commissioner for Human Rights as coordinator.

Advancing Economic Freedom

Second, we seek to advance economic freedom. Overcoming poverty is a central objective of U.S. foreign policy. President Bush has said that a world in which half of humanity lives on \$2 per day is neither just nor stable. In 2002, world leaders came to a new and balanced consensus on the requirements for development at the Financing for Development conference in Monterrey, Mexico. They agreed that the formula for economic growth and development includes national responsibility, good governance, trade liberalization, and mobilizing resources from within countries and abroad.

The United States is fulfilling its commitments to implement the Monterrey consensus. We have taken a leading role in liberalizing trade in the World Trade Organization. We have increased development assistance by 50 percent in the past four years. The Millennium Challenge Account is President Bush's initiative to support those countries that rule justly, invest in their people, and encourage economic freedom. If fully funded, it would represent the largest increase in U.S. assistance since the Marshall Plan.

In addition to assistance provided by the U.S. government, the interest and generosity of the American people is manifest in the significant levels of U.S. private foreign aid donations. Contributions by U.S. foundations such as the Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation, the David and Lucille Packard Foundation, and the U.N. Foundation now total some \$3 billion. American organizations such as the Red Cross, Catholic Relief Services, and the YMCA give almost \$7 billion a year in foreign assistance, including volunteer time. These private aid flows alone surpass the levels of foreign assistance provided by generous government donors such as Denmark, Norway, and Sweden.

Since Monterrey, the U.N. has given disproportionate attention to the amount of aid offered to developing countries. To be effective in supporting sustainable growth, aid needs an enabling environment of good governance, including rule of law, property rights, [and] the elimination of corruption. The U.N. and its members need to spend less time exhorting donors to provide more aid and more time promoting pro-growth policies. One positive development occurred earlier this year, when the U.N. Commission on the Private Sector and Development identified the essential role of small entrepreneurs in promoting sustained growth and eradicating poverty.

Furthering the Roadmap to Middle East Peace

Our third General Assembly priority is to further the Roadmap to peace in the Middle East. The United States continues to actively pursue President Bush's goal of Israel and a future Palestine living together in peace and security. To this end, the U.S. is working to achieve the goals of the Roadmap, which has broad support within the international community and has been endorsed by the Security Council. The United States seeks to bring balance to the number and content of Middle East resolutions.

The 58th U.N. General Assembly adopted 21 resolutions concerning the Israeli-Palestinian conflict. Many of those resolutions implied that only Israel has obligations and responsibilities to make peace. They failed to address both sides of the larger security context of the Middle East,

including devastating suicide attacks against Israel. They pressed the case of the Palestinians, but failed to present a complete picture of the situation on the ground, condemn all acts of terrorism, and recognize the legitimate security concerns of the Israeli people. One-sided resolutions only serve to undermine the ability of the United Nations to play a constructive role in promoting peace.

As in previous years, the U.S. will encourage the General Assembly to reduce the overall number of Middle East resolutions introduced. The U.S. also hopes the General Assembly will adopt a resolution condemning anti-Semitism and include [a] reference to anti-Semitism in other relevant resolutions. We will continue to advocate for the abolition of the Special Committee to Investigate Israeli practices, as well as the abolition of other bodies that are biased against Israel.

The international community has long recognized that resolution of this conflict must come through negotiated settlement. The United States seeks to bring balance to Middle East resolutions to better support the peace process and the implementation of the Roadmap.

Ending Trafficking in Persons, Particularly Child Sex Tourism

Fourth, the United States seeks to strengthen collaboration with governments and civil society to combat trafficking in persons, particularly to end child sex tourism. Trafficking in persons is modern-day slavery. Annually, an estimated 600,000 to 800,000 people -- mostly children and women -- are trafficked across national borders.

Child sex tourism involves adult tourists who sexually exploit minors abroad, preying upon the most defenseless among us. The United States is asking governments to immediately expand and invigorate their anti-trafficking efforts. Increased rescues of trafficking victims and prosecutions of traffickers are critically needed. People freed from slavery must be treated as victims of crime, and not as criminals themselves.

Because human trafficking is transnational in nature, international partnerships are critical to win the fight against this modern-day slavery. Cooperation with other countries has contributed to the prosecution worldwide of nearly 8,000 perpetrators of trafficking crimes, resulting in more than 2,800 convictions in 2003. Trafficking is not a victimless or harmless crime, and governments should engage the public in a campaign to help expose and end this tragic exploitation of human beings turned into commodities.

Banning Human Cloning

Our fifth priority theme at the General Assembly is our effort to ban human cloning. Human cloning, for any purpose whatsoever, is unethical and morally reprehensible, and flouts respect for human dignity. At the General Assembly, the United States will join a large group of states that are co-sponsoring a resolution, proposed by Costa Rica, to draft an international convention against human cloning.

The United States supports efforts to ban all forms of human cloning. The process commonly referred to as cloning -- Somatic Cell Nuclear Transfer -- results in the creation of a human embryo. In "reproductive" cloning, this embryo is implanted into a woman's womb and allowed to grow. In what has been called "therapeutic," "research," and "experimental" cloning, the stem cells are removed from the embryo, destroying this nascent human life.

A ban that differentiates between human reproductive and "experimental" cloning would essentially authorize the creation of a human embryo for the purpose of destroying it, thus elevating the value of research and experimentation above that of a human life. Such a partial ban, which would prohibit reproductive cloning but permit "experimental" cloning is therefore unacceptable.

Conclusion: Summing Up on U.N. Reform

While the topics I mentioned comprise the five priority themes for this year's General Assembly, they by no means constitute the entirety of our efforts there. We continue to engage daily to prevent the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction, to rally support for the fight against terrorism, to promote human rights, and to assist and protect the needy. Everything we do is couched within the context of our guiding principles to live up to the vision of the U.N.'s founders, to support effective multilateralism, and to provide good stewardship of the U.N.'s resources.

Reform cannot be undertaken overnight. We cannot remake the U.N. from whole cloth. In fact, we would not desire to do so. The United Nations does not require a new doctrine or machinery. Many of the existing legal norms and ostensible principles are sound. We have offered our ideas for improvement and are interested in hearing what other countries have to say about reform.

We seek a U.N. that lives up to its premises and is revitalized. Dialogue and a respectful give-and-take are the bedrock of multilateral negotiations. We believe that the depth of our commitment to the U.N. should be judged not merely by our willingness to compromise with others, but

by our success in challenging the U.N. to stand by its principles. We should be measured not only by our willingness to follow, but also by our ability to lead by persuasion and example. We are recommitting ourselves to both of those pillars of leadership. We know we need to do so.

*EPF203 09/14/2004

Text: U.S. Engaged in Extensive Outreach on New Visa Waiver Rules

(Visitors need machine-readable passport or U.S. visa beginning Oct. 26)

The United States is engaged in extensive outreach and will continue an ongoing effort to make certain that Visa Waiver Program travelers are aware of a requirement effective October 26 that they must possess machine-readable passports in order to enter the country without a visa, according to State Department Spokesman Richard Boucher in a September 13 statement.

Beginning October 26, all travelers from 27 countries participating in the Visa Waiver Program must present either a machine-readable passport or a valid U.S. visa upon entry to the United States.

"We are confident that Visa Waiver travelers will not be deterred or inconvenienced by this change," said Boucher.

Visa waiver countries are:

Andorra, Austria, Australia, Belgium, Brunei, Denmark, Finland, France, Germany, Iceland, Ireland, Italy, Japan, Liechtenstein, Luxembourg, Monaco, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Portugal, San Marino, Singapore, Slovenia, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, and the United Kingdom (for citizens with the unrestricted right of permanent abode in England, Scotland, Wales, Northern Ireland, the Channel Islands and the Isle of Man).

Further information on the visa waiver program is available at http://travel.state.gov/visa/tempvisitors_novisa_waiver.html

Following is the text of the Boucher statement on the machine-readable passport requirement:

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF STATE
Office of the Spokesman
September 13, 2004

STATEMENT BY RICHARD BOUCHER, SPOKESMAN
Machine-Readable Passport Requirement

The State Department is continuing its efforts to notify visitors of the new guidelines for entry into the United States. As the October 26 deadline for Visa Waiver Program travelers to possess machine-readable passports approaches, our embassies and consulates have engaged in extensive outreach to make certain that eligible individuals are aware of this requirement. We are confident that Visa Waiver travelers will not be deterred or inconvenienced by this change.

In September 2003, the Secretary granted a postponement until October 26, 2004, as the date by which Visa Waiver Program travelers from 21 countries must present a machine-readable passport at a port of entry to be admitted to the U.S. without a visa. Since the granting of this one-year waiver, the governments of Visa Waiver countries have been working to meet this requirement, and we believe that they have dedicated appropriate resources to ensure that their nationals possess machine-readable passports. In addition, on a case-by-case basis, immigration officers at ports of entry may give a one-time waiver to those carrying non-machine-readable passports.

Nationals of the five countries that did not request -- and therefore did not receive -- a waiver of the machine-readable passport requirement, Andorra, Brunei, Liechtenstein, Luxembourg, and Slovenia, have been presenting only machine-readable passports since October 1, 2003.

Belgian nationals who wish to travel under the auspices of the Visa Waiver Program have been required to present a machine-readable passport since May 15, 2003. This requirement was stipulated in the Department of Justice's review of Belgium's continued eligibility to participate in the Visa Waiver Program in February 2003.

In the coming weeks we will continue our on-going effort to make all Visa Waiver travelers aware of the machine-readable passport requirement to avoid any possible disruptions of travel.

*EPF205 09/14/2004

Text: U.S. to Target Ships from Countries with Uncertain Security

(Coast Guard to focus on vessels posing greatest risk)

The U.S. Coast Guard has announced it will intensify scrutiny of ships registered in countries with substandard maritime security as well as vessels coming from ports in countries in which implementation of the new international security regime is uncertain.

In a September 10 news release, the agency in the Department of Homeland Security said it will be increasingly boarding vessels flying the flags of countries that have not implemented basic antiterrorist security measures. Those countries include Antigua and Barbuda, Bolivia, Cayman Islands, Cook Islands, Cyprus, Honduras, Hong Kong, Malta, the Netherlands, Panama, Russia, Singapore and Thailand, according to the agency's targeting guidelines published on its website (<http://www.uscg.mil/hq/g%2Dm/pscweb/FlagSecurity.htm>).

The agency must focus its resources on ships that pose the greatest risk, Coast Guard Commandant Thomas Collins said in the release.

From July 1, when the new international security standards came into force, through July 31, the Coast Guard detained, denied entry to or took other actions against 59 vessels, the agency said in a July compliance report.

The International Ship and Port Facility Security (ISPS) Code requires ships and ports to implement basic security procedures such as identification checks and restricted access to secure areas.

The Coast Guard also said it will be increasingly boarding vessels coming from ports in the 17 countries that have failed to report compliance with the ISPS to the International Maritime Organization or to it. These countries include Albania, Benin, Democratic Republic of Congo, Equatorial Guinea, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Kiribati, Lebanon, Liberia, Madagascar, Mozambique, Nauru, Nigeria, Serbia and Montenegro, Sierra Leone, Solomon Islands and Suriname, according to a September 9 agency advisory.

In another news release issued September 10, the agency recommended that U.S.-bound ships take security precautions before calling on ports in these countries to avoid extra Coast Guard scrutiny.

Following are the texts of the news releases and the advisory:

U.S. Department of Homeland Security
United States Coast Guard

Press Release

September 10, 2004

COAST GUARD TARGETS VESSELS FROM COUNTRIES FOR INCREASED BOARDINGS

WASHINGTON -- The Coast Guard today issued a list of countries whose vessels will be targeted for increased boardings because of two months of below-average compliance with international security standards.

"Approximately 200 vessels call on U.S. ports every day," said Adm. Thomas H. Collins, commandant of the Coast Guard. "We must focus our resources on those ships that present the greatest risk. The past compliance of vessels from these countries shows us that they haven't implemented basic security measures, increasing the security risk posed to our ports when they arrive here."

The Coast Guard examined the results of its July and August security compliance boardings to determine which countries' vessels had a higher than average rate of compliance problems that resulted in a detention, denial of entry or other major control action.

Targeting vessels from these countries for increased boardings helps the Coast Guard focus its attention on vessels that present a higher risk, and is one element of a larger matrix that helps Coast Guard field commanders consistently target vessels for boardings. Other elements include the past performance of the individual vessel, its ship management company, recognized security organization and the security in its last five ports of call. Vessels are also targeted for boardings based on intelligence information, or on a random basis.

The list will be updated on a monthly basis until the first annual report is issued, expected to be in April 2005, at which point countries will be targeted for an entire year.

The new international security standards, the International Ship and Port Facility Security Code, came into full effect on July 1, and required vessels that travel internationally to implement basic security procedures, such as identification checks and securing of restricted areas. Starting on July 1, the Coast Guard has boarded every foreign vessel on its first port call to the United States.

More information on the Coast Guard's port state control program, including the list of targeted countries can be found at: <http://www.uscg.mil/hq/g-m/pscweb>.

U.S. Department of Homeland Security
United States Coast Guard

Press Release

September 10, 2004

COAST GUARD ISSUES LIST OF COUNTRIES THAT HAVE NOT REPORTED FULL COMPLIANCE WITH NEW INTERNATIONAL PORT SECURITY REQUIREMENTS

WASHINGTON -- The U.S. Coast Guard alerted the maritime community today that it has concerns about the security of ports in 17 countries because those countries have failed to report compliance with new international port security requirements.

The Coast Guard will be targeting vessels for increased boardings when arriving in U.S. ports if they have visited one of those countries during their last five port calls.

"Shipping is a global industry," said Adm. Thomas Collins, commandant of the Coast Guard. "In order for us to protect our ports, we must be concerned about the security of the entire shipping chain, including ports overseas."

"We strongly encourage all nations to take steps to protect their ports," he said. "Terrorism is a global problem, and an attack on any country's ports could have a significant impact on their economy."

Countries were required to provide the International Maritime Organization information about their ports' compliance with new international security requirements by July 1. The Coast Guard has a range of concerns about the information reported from these 17 countries, including reports that they are not in full compliance, incomplete reports, or no reports at all.

"Right now, we are relying on countries to report the actions they have taken to increase security in their ports," Collins said. "Over the next three years, we plan to visit 135 countries around the world to share and align our security practices. We will use that information to help us make decisions about security for vessels arriving here. In the meantime, it is vital that countries report this information so that all countries can take proper steps to protect their ports."

The Coast Guard recommends that vessels calling on ports in these countries take several steps to protect themselves, which the Coast Guard will take into consideration when making decisions about boardings and other port state control actions. Those steps include setting a higher security condition, in keeping with their vessel security plans; executing a declaration of security that details specific security arrangements between the vessel and the port facility; logging their actions and reporting those actions to the Coast Guard Captain of the Port prior to arrival in the United States.

The port security advisory issued to the maritime community and list of countries can be viewed at: <http://www.uscg.mil/hq/g-m/mp/mapipsp.html>.

International Port Security Program

U.S. Coast Guard

September 9, 2004

Port Security Advisory

The below countries failed to communicate to the International Maritime Organization (IMO) or the U.S. Coast Guard all information regarding port facility security information as required by Regulation 13 of Chapter XI-2 of the International Convention for the Safety of Life at Sea, 1974 (SOLAS) or the Maritime Transportation Security Act of 2002 (MTSA).

Albania, Benin, Dem. Rep. of Congo, Equatorial Guinea, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Kiribati, Lebanon, Liberia, Madagascar, Mozambique, Nauru, Nigeria, Serbia and Montenegro, Sierra Leone, Solomon Islands, Suriname.

Failure to submit the required information indicates noncompliance with the port facility requirements of the International Ship and Port Facility Security (ISPS) Code and leads us to believe there are inadequate anti-terrorism measures in place at port facilities in these countries.

Vessels that have visited a country listed above during their last five port calls will be subject to increased Port State Control actions upon arrival at a U.S. port.

If a vessel takes the recommended steps outlined below, the vessel's security posture will be considered and reflected in the location, scope, intensity and duration of the Port State Control measures.

- a. Set a higher security level;
- b. Execute a Declaration of Security;

- c. Log all security actions in the ship's log; and
- d. Report the actions taken directly to the cognizant U.S. Coast Guard Captain of the Port prior to arrival.

If the above countries fail to comply with the ISPS Code or MTSA by 9 November 2004, a new Port Security Advisory will be issued. This Advisory will warn vessels arriving in U.S. ports from noncompliant countries of the additional Port State Control measures that will be imposed.

*EPF211 09/14/2004

CIA Nominee Pledges Objective, Precise Intelligence

(Congressional Report, September 14: Goss Confirmation Hearing)

Washington -- The man nominated by President Bush to head the Central Intelligence Agency says he can provide the president with the objective and precise intelligence needed to enhance the country's national security.

U.S. Representative Porter J. Goss also said he can be non-partisan in his approach to the director's job. Goss testified September 14 at his confirmation hearing before the Senate Intelligence Committee.

Goss, the former Republican chairman of the House Intelligence Committee, was nominated by Bush August 10 to become the new CIA director. He would succeed George Tenet, who resigned July 11 after criticism of the intelligence community in the fight against terrorism.

Senate Intelligence Committee Vice Chairman John D. Rockefeller said the stakes are enormous facing the new director -- a nation at war against a shadowy terrorist network, and simultaneous military operations in Afghanistan and Iraq.

Goss said he agreed with criticism leveled at the U.S. intelligence community by the 9/11 Commission, which undertook nearly two years of hearings to examine the September 11, 2001, terrorist attacks on the United States.

"I agree wholeheartedly with the 9/11 commissioners that the intelligence community management must foster and nurture imagination throughout the intelligence community, not to stifle it," Goss said.

The 9/11 Commission, formally known as the National Commission on the Terrorist Attacks Upon the United States, criticized the CIA and other intelligence agencies for not uncovering the terrorist plot to attack the United States, among other perceived shortcomings.

Goss' nomination comes as Congress is considering numerous bills that would reorganize or revamp the 15-member U.S. intelligence community, create a new post of national intelligence director with sweeping authority and establish a National Counterterrorism Center.

At the time of his nomination, the president praised Goss as a leader with strong experience in intelligence matters.

"He is the right man to lead this important agency at this critical moment in our nation's history," Bush said.

Goss will have to be confirmed by the Senate Intelligence Committee before being considered by the U.S. Senate. The Senate confirms nominations to head key federal agencies as well as cabinet officers. Senate Majority Leader Bill Frist has said he expects to complete the confirmation of Goss to head the CIA in the week of September 20-24, well before Congress adjourns this year.

Goss was born in Connecticut and is a Yale University graduate. He launched his intelligence career in the 1960s, working first in U.S. Army intelligence for two years and then serving for approximately 10 years as a CIA case officer in the clandestine service before an illness forced him into early retirement.

Goss entered the U.S. House of Representatives from Florida in 1988. He has served in Congress for 16 years, including eight years as chairman of the House Permanent Select Intelligence Committee.

(Preceding items distributed by the Bureau of International Information Programs, U.S. Department of State. Web site: <http://usinfo.state.gov>)